12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	ADAM R. FULTON, ESQ.		
2	Nevada Bar No. 11572		
	afulton@jfnvlaw.com		
3	LOGAN G. WILLSON, ESQ.		
	Nevada Bar No. 14967		
4	logan@jfnvlaw.com		
_	JENNINGS & FULTON, LTD.		
5	2580 Sorrel Street		
6	Las Vegas, NV 89146		
	Telephone: (702) 979-3565		
7	Facsimile: (702) 362-2060		
	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COU		
9	GIATED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
10			
11	MATEUSZ SASIADA, an individual,	Case No.: 2:23-cv-0	
' '			

Case No.: 2:23-cv-00088-JCM-NJK

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND BRIEFING DEADLINES **REGARDING DEFENDANT'S** MOTION TO COMPEL **ARBITRATION** [ECF No. 9]

(SECOND REQUEST)

CORPORATIONS I-X, inclusive, Defendants.

SWITCH, LTD., a Nevada Limited Liability

Company; DOES I-X, inclusive; and ROE

Plaintiff,

VS.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Plaintiff MATEUSZ SASIADA, by and through his attorneys of record, ADAM R. FULTON, ESQ. and LOGAN G. WILLSON, ESQ., of the law firm of JENNINGS & FULTON, LTD., and Defendant SWITCH, LTD., by and through its attorneys of record, WENDY M. KRINCEK, ESQ. and MICHAEL D. DISSINGER, ESQ., of the law firm of LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. (collectively herein the "parties"), to continue the briefing deadlines regarding Defendant's Motion To Compel Arbitration And To Dismiss The Action, Or, Alternatively, To Stay The Action Pending Arbitration [ECF No. 9] (the "Motion").¹

Pursuant to LR IC 2-2(b), Defendant's Motion was filed as two separate ECFs (Nos. 9 and 10). Accordingly, the parties submit two separate stipulations to extend the briefing deadlines for the

Plaintiff's counsel starts an estimated 3-4 week jury trial in the Eighth Judicia			
District Court for Clark County, Nevada on May 15, 2023, in Case No. A-21-831496-B			
DGMD Real Estate Investments, LLC v. Jim Mueller, et al. Thus, Plaintiff's counsel has an			
unavoidable conflict, and good cause exists to extend the current Opposition deadline from			
May 18, 2023 to <u>June 1, 2023</u> . Additionally, the extension of Plaintiff's deadline to file an			
Opposition creates a scheduling conflict for Defendant that constitutes good cause to			
provide additional time for Defendant to file the Reply in Support of the Motion			
Specifically, Defendant's in-house counsel will be out of the country the first two weeks of			
June and will be unable to review until June 15, 2023. Given the scheduling conflict, the			
parties further stipulate that the deadline for Defendant to file its Reply in Support of the			
Motion will be <u>June 22, 2023</u> .			

Motion. A stipulation addressing ECF No. 10 is submitted contemporaneously herewith. LR IC 2-**2(b).**

Case 2:23-cv-00088-JCM-NJK Document 17 Filed 05/19/23 Page 3 of 3